

Holland Township Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting
Minutes of the July 30, 2014

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Ginger Crawford:

“I call to order the July 30, 2014 Regular Meeting of the Holland Township Board of Adjustment. Adequate notice of this meeting was given pursuant to the Open Public Meeting Act Law by the Planning Board Secretary on December 12, 2013 by:

1. Posting such notice on the bulletin board at the Municipal Building.
2. Published in the December 12, 2013 issue of the Hunterdon County Democrat
3. Faxed to the Express Times for informational purposes

Flag Salute:

Chairman Crawford asked all too please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

Identification of those at the podium for the benefit of the recording machine:

Present: Wilson “Bo” Baker, Jerry Bowers, Laura Burke, Ginger Crawford, Peter Kanakaris, Les Gallipeau, William Martin, Gail Rader, Todd Bolig, Esq., Robert Martucci, Engineer, Lucille Grozinski, CSR, and Maria Elena Jennette Kozak, Secretary.

Absent: Bill Ethem and Elizabeth McKenzie, Planner

Let the record show there is a quorum.

Minutes: A motion was made by Wilson “Bo” Baker and seconded by Jerry Bowers , to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the meeting on June 25, 2014 and to approve as submitted. All Present were in favor with the exception of Gail Rader who abstained. Motion carried.

Completeness

- There was nothing scheduled for completeness.

Public Hearing

- . There were no public hearings scheduled.

Resolution

Jane E. Beale – Block 27 Lot 11 – Old River Road – Bulk Variance Application - received into our office on March 6, 2014. The 45-day completeness review deadline is April 20, 2014. On the March 26 2014 agenda. Deemed Incomplete 032614. New material submitted April 16, 2014. The 45-day completeness deadline is May 31, 2014. Deemed complete April 30, 2014. Public Hearing scheduled for May 28, 2014 and carried to June 25, 2014 where the public hearing took place. Approved with conditions June 25, 2014. Resolution prepared and distributed as follows:

RE2014-0XX

THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
OF THE TOWNSHIP OF HOLLAND

RESOLUTION APPROVING VARIANCE
RELIEF PURSUANT TO *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(1)*
FOR BLOCK 27, LOT 11, LOCATED ON
OLD RIVER ROAD, BY APPLICANT, JANE E. BEALE

WHEREAS, Jane E. Beale, (the “Applicant”) is title owner of Block 27, Lot 11 (the “Subject Property”) which is situate in Holland Township’s Residential “R-5” zone;

WHEREAS, the Applicant has applied to the Holland Township Board of Adjustment for relief pursuant to *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(1)*;

WHEREAS, the Applicant seeks variance relief from §100-46 of the Township of Holland Zoning Ordinances as pertaining to an undersize lot, to wit: Block 27, Lot 11 which is situate in Holland Township’s R-5 zone, a zone that requires a minimum of five (5) acres for a building permit to be issued for the construction of a residence;

WHEREAS, Applicant seeks the ability to build a single family residential structure on the subject lot which has an approximate size of 3.05 acres thereby requiring variance relief from §100-46 of the Township of Holland Zoning Ordinances which requires lots in the R-5 zone to be a minimum of five (5) acres;

WHEREAS, the application, dated March 5, 2014, was filed with the Holland Township Board of Adjustment’s Secretary on or about March 6, 2014 (the “Application”) and was the subject of a public hearing before this Board, for purposes of determining completeness, on the 26th day of March, 2014, and the 30th day of April, 2014;

- O-3 Correspondence dated June 25, 2014 from Messrs. Eric Starosielski and Patrick Jones to the Holland Township Zoning Board of Appeals containing therein correspondence bilaterally between Gaetano M. DeSapio, Esq. and Messrs. Starosielski and Jones, as well as a draft “Contract for Sale of Real Estate” prepared by Messrs. Starosielski and Jones;
- O-4 Appraisal of Real Property for Block 27, Lot 11 and Block 18, Lot 14 as of June 6, 2014 as prepared by Lawrence R. Viarengo of Robert F. Heffernan & Associates; and
- O-5 Garden State Multiple Listing Service reports consisting of 10 pages.

WHEREAS, all jurisdictional requirements have been satisfied by the Applicant;

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment of Holland Township has reviewed the exhibits submitted by both the Applicant and the Objectors, and the Board having heard and considered the evidence and testimony given by the Applicants and from the public in attendance, and having heard from both the Applicant’s and the Board’s professionals with respect to the Application, the Board makes the following **findings of fact**:

1. The Board had jurisdiction to proceed, all necessary notices having been timely served and published;
2. All taxes have been paid;
3. Application fees were paid and review escrows established;
4. The Application has been deemed complete as of April 30, 2014;
5. **Jane E. Beale**, Applicant, after being duly sworn according to law, testified that:
 - A. She is the title owner of Block 27, Lot 11, and Block 18, Lot 14;
 - B. The Subject Property (Block 27, Lot 11) is approximately 3.05 acres and is located in the Township’s R-5 Zone which requires a minimum of five acres for the issuance of a building permit;
 - C. The property owned by the Applicant to the west of the Subject Property (Block 18, Lot 14) is approximately 0.47 acres;
 - D. The Subject Property has been listed for sale for approximately four years with a realtor’s sign present on the Subject Property during this period;
 - E. Lot 12, which is south of the Subject Property, has a deed restriction which would prohibit any sub-division of that Lot 12, in order to make the Subject Property conform to the Township’s R-5, five acre minimum lot size requirement;
 - F. Lot 25, which is north of the Subject Property and which has a house situate thereon, is presently undersized at 3.58 acres, and any acquisition of property from that Lot 25 would render it further non-conforming;
 - G. Exhibit A-2 shows the proposed location of the home, the septic, and the driveway all of which conform to Holland Township’s Zoning Ordinances;
 - H. The Hunterdon County Health Department has approved a septic system design for the Subject Property (Exhibit A-4);
 - I. The Hunterdon County Soil Conservation District has approved a “Soil Erosion Plan” for the Subject Property (Exhibit A-5);
 - J. The Subject Property, due to its proximity to the Delaware River and because it is situate in floodway, flood hazard area and fifty-foot riparian zone of the Delaware River, required the Applicant to obtain a permit(s) from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection enabling the construction of a single family dwelling along with the attendant garage, well, septic system and sanitary sewer facility on the Subject Property (Exhibit A-6);
 - K. The Subject Property, while located in the Highland Planning Area, is exempt under Exemption No. 2 from New Jersey’s Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council review per Exhibit A-7 as the intended use of the Subject Property is for a single-family residence, and is also exempt as the Subject Property existed prior to the adoption of the Highland’s Act in 2004;
 - L. The Applicant does not intend to construct a residence on the Subject Property, however, she intends to sell the Subject Property with a pre-approved variance grant enabling her successors in title to construct a dwelling on the property. Applicant also indicated that the series of architectural renderings submitted as Exhibit A-8 are merely representative of the type and character of a structure which could be built upon the Subject Property. Applicant agreed, as a condition of approval, that any proposed house design would be subject to review, comment and approval by Holland Township’s Historic Commission;
 - M. The Applicant had engaged the title company of Cortes and Hay, Inc. who issued a “Report of Title - Sixty Year Search” dated May 22, 2014, which search revealed a “Historical and Conservation Easement”, dated October 16, 1979, Book 853, Pages 22 through 30, at Page 24, which prohibits the sub-division of Block 27, Lot 12;
 - N. The entirety of River Road is located within the Township’s “Historic District”;
 - O. River Road provides the only access to the Subject Property, however, there exists a rudimentary “farm road” which crosses railroad tracks;
 - P. Applicant, having met with the Messrs. Jones and Starosielski, and having received an offer of \$42,500 from them, immediately prior to the June 25th meeting, and the Applicant having reduced the sales price from the original price of \$69,000 to \$66,000, to correlate with Holland Township’s tax assessed value, considered any further attempts at negotiating the sales price at an

“impasse” as the proffer by Messrs. Jones and Starosielski was considered by her to be unreasonable and not the “fair market value” of the Subject Property; and

Q. Applicant did not file a tax appeal for Block 27, Lot 11 nor Block 18, Lot 14, following Holland Township’s 2013 municipal reassessment.

6. **John Seidler**, after being duly sworn according to law, testified that:

- A. He is the Applicant’s husband;
- B. The Subject Property was subject to a “very severe flood” three to four years ago with water levels receding within one day. As a result of the Subject Property’s location, any dwelling located thereon would have to be built eleven feet (11’) above grade;
- C. His wife has been attempting to sell the Subject Property for three to four years through a realtor;
- D. The Applicant offered several years ago to sell the Subject Property to the owners of Lot 25;
- E. He is not aware of any lots in the area of the Subject Property, other than Lot 12 and Lot 29.04, which is a factory, which are in excess of 5.0 acres;
- F. He personally took all of the photographs marked A-14 (A through I) while travelling north on River Road from Church Road, and are representative of the properties, homes, and other structures along River Road. Specifically, he testified to each of aforesaid exhibits as follows:

- 1. Exhibit A-14(a): Picture of house situate on Lot 18, which is situate on 0.65 acres;
- 2. Exhibit A-14(b): Picture of house situate on Lot 16.01;
- 3. Exhibit A-14(c): Picture of house situate on Lot 16;
- 4. Exhibit A-14(d): Picture of barn situate on Lot 16;
- 5. Exhibit A-14(e): Picture of house situate on Lot 13.02;
- 6. Exhibit A-14(f): Picture of house situate on Lot 13;
- 7. Exhibit A-14(g): Picture of house situate on Lot 12;
- 8. Exhibit A-14(h): Picture of Applicant’s Subject Property taken from Old River Road;
- 9. Exhibit A-14(i): Picture of Applicant’s Subject Property taken from approximately the middle of the lot where

any proposed house would be constructed; and

- 10. Exhibit A-14(j): Picture of house situate on Lot 25.

6. **Eric Starosielski**, after being duly sworn according to law, testified that:

- A. He and his wife are the title owners to Block 27, Lot 12, 165 Old River Road, having acquired title to same approximately four years ago;
- B. He and his wife moved to their property in September of 2013;
- C. He is prohibited by way of deed restriction from selling any portion of his property;
- D. He had seen the Applicant’s “For Sale” sign on the Subject Property;
- E. Neither he nor his wife attempted to purchase the Subject Property as they deemed the Subject Property “not useful at the listed price of \$69,000.00” as they would not build upon the Subject Property, and would leave it in its current un-developed state;
- F. There exists a “thinly” wooded area between his home and the Subject Property, and approximates the distance between his existing house and Applicant’s lot at three hundred feet (300’);
- G. The Starosielski’s property is to the east and to the south of the Subject Property;
- H. He believes that the Subject Property is one of the properties designated by the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Register of Historic Places Inventory (Exhibit O-1); and
- I. He is not aware of any prohibition against the Applicant’s building upon the Subject Property.

7. **Patrick Jones**, after being duly sworn according to law, testified that:

- A. He and his wife, Xiaohua Jones, are the title owners of Lot 25;
- B. The Jones purchased their lot from Mr. Seidler;
- C. In the event he successfully purchased the Subject Property, he would not develop the Subject Property as he would seek to preserve that property in its present state;

- D. Mr. Jones tendered a purchase offer contract to the Applicant for \$42,500, and met with the Applicant and her attorney immediately prior to the June 25th meeting. Mr. Jones rejected the reduced sales price of \$66,000 as offered by the Applicant, in reliance upon Mr. Heffernan’s appraised value; and
- E. Mr. Jones did not believe that negotiations had reached an impasse.

8. **Robert F. Heffernan**, S.C.G.R.E.A., S.R.A., after being duly sworn according to law, testified that:

- A. He walked the Applicant’s two lots in June of 2014 and found the Subject Property to be “relatively level” while he found the Applicant’s second lot (Block 18, Lot 14) along the Delaware River, west of River Road, to be “fairly steep”;
- B. The appraisal was prepared by Lawrence R. Viarengo, of Robert F. Heffernan & Associates, with Mr. Heffernan’s review and approval of the records utilized in the preparation of the appraisal by Mr. Viarengo;
- C. The appraisal was prepared with the understanding that the Applicant had previously obtained an approved septic plan and the issuance of the attendant septic permit;
- D. The Appraisal was prepared without the preparer’s knowledge that the Applicant had previously obtained a New Jersey Department of Environment Protection permit for the construction of a single-family residence on the Subject Property;
- E. The appraisal was made through the utilization of an “extra-ordinary assumption” which assumed that an appropriate variance(s) would be granted enabling the construction of a residence on the undersized Subject Property;
- F. The Subject Property has “very good” views of the Delaware River especially during the Winter;
- G. The Subject Property is located in a “semi-rural” area near to the Delaware River which area has various homes, four cottages, and a “new home”, owned by Mr. and Mrs. Jones, which is elevated on pylons twelve feet (12’) above grade, and which is situate across River Road from the Subject Property;
- H. The Subject Property is the only vacant lot in the area which he is aware of that is available for purchase;
- I. He was unable to utilize or find comparable sales in Holland Township or Hunterdon County, which have both a similar lot size and a “water feature”, i.e., a view of or proximity to a body of water, for the appraisal of the Subject Property;
- J. The three comparable sales utilized in the appraisal were all located in Warren County which he stated are “less sought after than (property) in Hunterdon County”;
- K. The following three comparable sales were utilized in the appraisal:

1. **Comparable Sale No. 1 (51 River Road)**

- a. Not as close to Delaware River as Subject Property;
- b. Only permitted a “Winter view” of Delaware River unlike that of Subject Property which has year-round views;
- c. This property characterized by a very steep lot which he testified “costs more to develop and build”;
- d. This property is not located in a flood plain therefore price was adjusted for a “slab” basement versus an elevated home; and
- e. Made a price reduction due to acreage.

2. **Comparable Sale No. 2 (Hutchinson River Road)**

- a. Located in Harmony Township, Warren County;
- b. Located “very close” to the Delaware River, however, “not certain” that the property affords a “direct view” of the Delaware River;
- c. The property is approximately one-half acre in size;
- d. The house which existed thereon was “torn down” and “may or may not be developable”;
- e. The property last sold for \$29,900, and the land is not as valuable as that of the Subject Property;
- f. The property’s price was upwardly adjusted due to its location near the Delaware River; and
- g. Hutchinson River Road is a private, not public, road.

3. **Comparable Sale No. 3 (Blairstown, Hope Township, Warren County)**

- a. Located in Blairstown, Hope Township, Warren County;
- b. Property not on or close to the Delaware River;
- c. Property is 13.17 acres in size with an approximately 4.6 acre “pond / lake”;
- d. The appraisal utilized this property because of the pond / lake water feature;
- e. This property is a “buildable” lot;
- f. The property values are “slightly less” in Hope Township than in Holland Township; and

g. The property’s price adjustments reflect the property’s location, the presence of the water feature, and the fact that it is not situate within a flood plain.

L. That “some” of the comparable sales utilized in the appraisal may have been distressed sales due to the market, although those distressed property sales were not identified;

M. A potential buyer of the Subject Property may place a “premium” on the purchase price due to the lot’s seclusion and low-volume traffic, however, there would be a negative adjustment to price due to the lot’s existence within a flood plain;

N. The lot is an “unusual lot” requiring other “expert’s input” in the preparation of the subject Appraisal. Specifically, the cost of the undeveloped land would have to be reduced in order for a developer / buyer to both recover the various costs associated with building a prospective home above flood level including the required permitting, engineering and construction costs, and to realize a profit;

O. He consulted with an engineer who informed him that the utilities and mechanical systems would have to be raised on any house built upon the Subject Property, and the associated costs of doing so “must come off” the land value; and

P. He was not certain that he presented his expert engineer with a copy of the Applicant’s building plans.

8. **Robert Martucci**, P.E., after being duly sworn according to law, testified that:

A. No estimates of probable construction costs were presented by the Objector(s) or by any expert; and

B. While Mr. Heffernan’s assessed value of the Subject Property factored in the purported higher construction costs associated with the building of an elevated house, there was no credible testimony or documentation from an engineer or a building contractor that the cost of an elevated house, i.e., a house built on pilings, differed significantly from the typical costs of a home built using a traditional foundation and basement. Engineer Martucci opined that there would be little difference in the costs between the two construction methods.

10. The Application was properly noticed in accordance with the laws of the State of New Jersey, and the public was afforded the opportunity to present testimony in support of, or in opposition to, the Application, and with no other members of the public present, the public hearing portion of the meeting was closed.

WHEREAS, the Board of Adjustment of Holland Township has reviewed the exhibits submitted by the Applicants and the Board has heard and considered the evidence proffered and testimony given by the Applicant, Jane Beale, the Applicant’s husband, John Seidler, and the Applicant’s attorney, Gaetano DeSapio, Esq.;

WHEREAS, the Board having heard and considered the testimony from objectors to the Application, Patrick Jones and Eric Starosielski; and having heard and considered the testimony of Robert F. Heffernan, S.C.G.R.E.A., S.R.A., on behalf of Mr. Jones; and having heard and considered testimony from the Board’s professionals with respect to the Application, the Board makes the following **conclusions of law**:

1. The Board of Adjustment of Holland Township has jurisdiction in this matter with all required parties having been properly noticed in accordance with law;
2. Ordinance §100-46 of the Holland Township zoning ordinance requires a minimum lot size of 5.0 acres for the issuance of a building permit, and the Subject Property is undersized at 3.05 acres necessitating variance relief pursuant to *N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(1)*;
3. As all contiguous lots are either currently undersized or deed restricted, there is no land available for the Applicant to purchase to render the Subject Property a conforming lot. As such, Applicant has met her burden regarding one element of the “Positive Criteria” by evidencing her inability to purchase additional property from adjoining landowners in order to render the Subject Property compliant with Holland Township’s Zoning Ordinance. This fact was corroborated by the herein Objectors. *See, Commons v. Westwood Zoning Bd. of Adjustment*, 81 N.J. 597, 606 (1980);
4. *N.J.S.A. 54:40-23* states, in pertinent part, that the “Assessor shall, ..., after examination and inquiry determine the full and fair value of each parcel of real property ... at such price as, in his / her judgment, it would sell for at a fair and bona fide sale by private contract....”. As Applicant offered to sell the land to the adjoining owners at the assessed value established by the Township of Holland in accordance with *N.J.S.A. 54:40-23*, Applicant has met her burden regarding the second element of the “Positive Criteria” by evidencing her offer to sell her undersized lot at a fair and reasonable sales price, and at its tax assessed value which she did not appeal. *See, Commons v. Westwood Zoning Bd. of Adjustment*, 81 N.J. 597, 606 (1980);
5. The hardship attendant to the Subject Property was not self-created, as the Subject Property existed as early as 1921 which pre-dated the first Holland Township zoning ordinance enacted on August 23, 1967. *See, Commons v. Westwood Zoning Bd. of Adjustment*, 81 N.J. 597, 606 (1980);
6. Having established as a matter of law that the hardship is not self-created, and having further established the inability to acquire additional lands and the inability to sell the Subject Property at a fair and reasonable price, the strict application of the applicable provisions of the zoning ordinance would impose undue hardship and practical difficulties on the Applicant, to wit: Without the grant of the requested

relief, Applicant would be unable to build on the Subject Property, resulting in a compensable taking. *See, Dallmeyer v. Lacey Twp. Bd. of Adjustment*, 219 N.J.Super. 134, 139 (Law Div. 1987);

7. The requested relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zone plan as it has been demonstrated that a reasonably sized home can be built in conformance with all bulk and setback requirements of Holland Township's zoning ordinances. *See, Chirichello v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment of Monmouth Beach*, 78 N.J. 544, 557 (1979), and *Commons v. Westwood Zoning Bd. of Adjustment*, 81 N.J. 597 (1980);
8. With adherence to all of the conditions of approval as set forth below, the requested relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zone plan as the proposed home shall be elevated above-grade, on pylons, in a manner similar to the character and structure of a residence within the zone occupied by Mr. Jones and his wife. *See, Chirichello v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment of Monmouth Beach*, 78 N.J. 544, 557 (1979); and
9. Finally, the Board's Secretary was furnished with a letter dated June 18, 2014 from Mr. Robert Lubar, 166 Old River Road, and an email letter dated June 23, 2014 from Mr. Dave Malysa. Neither Mr. Lubar nor Mr. Malysa was in attendance at any public hearing and thus not available for cross-examination. As such, the Board's attorney refused to permit the introduction of those respective communications into evidence for consideration by the Board. *See, Seibert v. Dover Tp. Bd. of Adj.*, 147 N.J.Super. 548 (Law Div. 1980).

WHEREAS, on June 25, 2014, the Board of Adjustment of Holland Township voted with respect to Applicant's Application and attendant requested relief as follows:

1. **TO GRANT THE FOLLOWING VARIANCE:**

- A. Variance from §100-46 of the Holland Township Land Use Ordinance to permit the issuance of a building permit on the undersize Subject Property;

2. **SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

- A. The conditions as contained herein shall apply to the Applicant and to Applicant's successors in interest and assigns, and any successor in title to the Subject Property;
- B. Applicant, and Applicant's successors in interest and assigns, shall build an elevated residential structure on the Subject Property in a manner similar to that indicated by Applicant's A-8;
- C. While the Board duly notes the submission of Applicant's sample architectural plans showing an appropriately sized dwelling meeting all requirements of Holland Township's Zoning Ordinances, except for a one-foot (1') deviation in height, the Applicant and Applicant's successors in interest and assigns, shall build any proposed residential structure with dimensions not exceeding those as depicted by Applicant's A-9, however, the height of any proposed residential structure shall not exceed thirty-five feet (35') in height contrary to the height of thirty-six feet (36') as depicted on A-9;
- D. Construction of the dwelling and its appurtenances on the Subject Property shall not result in the ultimate disturbance of one (1) acre or more of land or a cumulative increase in impervious surface by one-quarter (1/4) acre or more, consistent with the parameters of Highland's Exemption No. 2;
- E. That Applicant, and Applicant's successors in interest and assigns, shall submit architectural drawings, schematics and floorplan depictions of any proposed residential structure on the Subject Property to Holland Township's Historic Commission for review, comment, and approval;
- F. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant, and Applicant's successors in interest and assigns shall comply with any comments and recommendations made by Holland Township's Historic Commission;
- G. The Applicant shall comply with any and all recommendations and / or requirements as set forth in any review(s) prepared by Holland Township's professionals in connection with this Application, and specifically those as set forth in the review letter dated April 23, 2014 from the Board's Engineer, Robert Martucci, P.E.;
- H. Applicant shall meet and satisfy all conditions of New Jersey's Department of Environmental Protection permits;
- I. Applicant shall apply for and obtain any and all local, county, state and federal permits and other outside agency approvals as may be required for any aspect of the construction as contemplated by this Application;
- J. Applicant shall comply with all other present rules and regulations; the effect of this decision being merely to relax the requirements or restrictions as set forth herein;
- K. Applicant shall pay to the Township of Holland any and all sums outstanding for fees incurred by the municipality for services rendered by the municipality's professionals for review of the Application, review and preparation of documents, inspections of improvements and other purposes as authorized by the New Jersey Municipal Land Use law, and Applicant shall pay all required review, inspection fees and professional fees to the Township of Holland prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- L. That a copy of this Resolution, certified by the Secretary of the Board of Adjustment to be a true copy be forwarded to the Applicant, to both the Code Enforcement Official and the Construction Code Official of the Township of Holland.

- M. The approval herein memorialized shall not constitute, nor be construed to constitute any approval, direct or indirect, of any aspect of a Site Plan, or its improvements, which are subject to third party agency review or jurisdiction, and which requires approvals by any third party agencies or other governmental bodies; and
- N. The terms and conditions of this approval shall be binding upon the Applicant, and the Applicant’s successors in interest and assigns. Further, each of the terms and conditions of this approval are material elements of the approval based upon the submission of the Application and the property in its entirety, and the non-compliance with any term or condition by the Applicant or their successors or assigns shall be deemed a material default subjecting the Application to revocation of this approval. The request to change any single condition, since all conditions are integrally related, shall open the entire Application to the Board of Adjustment for re-consideration, possible re-approval subject to new terms and conditions in addition to those terms and conditions presently existing in this approval.

ROLL CALL VOTE

Board Member	Motion	Second	Ayes	Nays	Abstain	Absent/Ineligible
Wilson “Bo” Baker		X	X			
Jerry Bowers			X			
Laura Burke			X			
Ginger Crawford			X			
Bill Ethem						X
Les Gallipeau	X		X			
Peter Kanakaris			X			
William Martin			X			
Gail Rader						X

Motion Carried By Vote of: Seven Ayes to Zero Nays

THIS RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD IS ADOPTED ON JULY 30, 2014 ON

ROLL CALL VOTE

Board Member	Motion	Second	Ayes	Nays	Abstain	Absent/Ineligible
Wilson “Bo” Baker						
Jerry Bowers						
Laura Burke						
Ginger Crawford						
Bill Ethem						X
Les Gallipeau						
Peter Kanakaris						
William Martin						
Gail Rader						X

Motion Carried By Vote of:

ATTEST:

Maria Elena Jeanette Kozak, Secretary
Township of Holland Board of Adjustment

Ginger Crawford, Chairperson
Township of Holland Board of Adjustment

After some discussion, a motion was made by Bill Martin and seconded by Jerry Bowers to approve the resolution as presented. At a roll call vote, all present were in favor of the motion with the exception of Gail Rader who abstained. Motion carried.

Old Business

- There was no Old Business to be discussed.

New Business:

- There was no new business scheduled.

Public Comment

There was no one present for public comment.

Model Conditions

Attorney Bolig present model conditions for consideration. Secretary Kozak to email everyone.

Les Gallipeau made a motion to adjourn. Motion carried.
Meeting ended at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Maria Elena Jennette Kozak
Maria Elena Jennette Kozak
Secretary